

amendment's adoption creates a win for both the environment and the need to address growing energy demand in our Nation. This amendment directs the Secretary of Energy to study and evaluate the availability of natural gas and oil deposits located off the coasts of Louisiana and Texas at existing drilling sites. This assessment every 2 years would allow an inventory of existing oil and gas supplies and evaluation of techniques or processes that may assist in keeping those wells productive.

I have several reasons for not supporting drilling in ANWR: the President has not made his case for drilling, the studies that have been conducted have questions regarding their accuracy, and there is no time table for how long it would take the process to begin, and finally I believe strongly that we must balance our Nation's energy needs with our stewardship of the environment.

This has been effectively done in the Gulf of Mexico off the Texas and Louisiana coasts. There are more than 3,800 working offshore platforms in the Gulf of Mexico, which provide 55,000 jobs to residents of Texas and Louisiana.

The Nation's record for safe and clean offshore natural gas and oil operations off the Texas and Louisiana coasts are excellent. The environmental soundness of oil and gas exploration in the gulf has been proven over many decades that have passed since offshore drilling began.

I know that energy exploration and sound environmental practices can go hand in hand, with the proper application of technology. I also know that our Nation's energy needs requires that we start today so that tomorrow our children and grandchildren can have a more secure and reliable source of energy. That is why I plan to vote for final passage of H.R. 4, Securing America's Future Energy Act of 2001.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to stand here today alongside Representative MARKEY, Representative NANCY JOHNSON, and the many other cosponsors of this critical legislation to say loud and clear—we will not sacrifice America's unique natural treasures to satisfy the whims of the oil industry.

Today, we are sending a bipartisan message to Congress and to our President: don't let the Energy bill pass out of Congress if it calls for tapping the arctic national wildlife refuge for oil, one of the most unblemished national resources in our Nation.

In my fight to ensure that the industry paid their fair share of the royalties that they owe to the Federal Government for taking oil from Federal lands, they claimed for years that their system for calculating royalties was fair. Now, they have settled lawsuits with the Federal Government and States for close to \$5 billion.

This may not be an admission of guilt, but it is the closest thing you will ever get from a multi-billion dollar industry that gets more wealthy each year.

After they ripped off American taxpayers for years, I must admit I am skeptical that this industry is terribly concerned with the "national interest" or preserving our Nation's most pristine resources.

We do not believe the oil industry when they claim that they can somehow extract millions of barrels of oil without leaving any trace. Does anyone remember the *Exxon Valdez*?

In 1995, there were more than 500 oil spills "reported" on the north slope, spilling over 80,000 gallons of oil, diesel fuel, and acid.

Is this considered "acceptable" environmental damage by this administration?

This is the number one priority of the environmental community. The main point is, oil rigs don't belong in the Arctic refuge. Oil drilling in this pristine area is both foolish and short sighted. Former justice William Douglas called the Arctic refuge "the most wonderful place on earth."

We need a balanced energy program. We should not allow the oil companies to drill everywhere. Protect the Arctic refuge. Vote for the Markey-Johnson amendment.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Mr. MARKEY and in opposition to the opening on the Alaska National Wildlife Reserve to oil and gas exploration.

I have not come to this position easily. I believe that the United States needs to expand production of oil and gas as much as we need to increase conservation. I have consistently supported increasing production in the outer continental shelf including off the coast of Florida and California. I believe that, based upon the U.S. Geological Survey, significant reserves exist along the coastal plane of ANWR. But, even at the highest possible estimate of recoverable reserves the production at ANWR would not materially decrease our dependency on imported oil, at peak production no more than seven percent of our daily demand. Since we have less than 5 percent of world petroleum reserves, ANWR development would not give the United States the purchasing power to offset the world markets. It would not, alone, solve our energy problems.

When weighing those facts against the risk which exploration and production would bring to the coastal plain, I fail to see where the potential benefits outweigh the risks. ANWR, first established by President Dwight Eisenhower, and later by an act of Congress during the late 1970's, is the last undisturbed coastal plain in Alaska. Specifically, section 1002, the area being considered, is the last stretch of protected coastal plain in Alaska. If it were opened to exploration and production, it would eliminate from ANWR any coastal area. And, it would bring risk to the delicate ecosystem which currently exists.

According to the Final Legislative Environmental Impact Statement (FLEIS or 1002 report) in April 1987 stated that, "the most biologically productive part of the Arctic Refuge for wildlife and is the center of wildlife activity." Some cite that caribou in the North Slope are increasing in population, from 3,000 to over 20,000. They fail to note that the predators have been reduced putting the populations out of balance. While I believe that development on the North Slope is an acceptable environmental risk, I do not see the urgency in increasing that risk at this time. I do not believe that energy development and environmental protection are incompatible, but I am not dismissive of the real environmental risk.

I do not believe either that the limitation of acres open to development will serve as a successful deterrent. As with any attempt to locate new reserves, producers will have to drill multiple wells to determine the actual location of the largest reserves. If we open a portion, we will ultimately open all. I am not convinced that at this time, the risk is worth the potential reward.

Again, I support our Nation's efforts to expand exploration and production. Unlike many

proponents and opponents of the Markey amendment, I am willing to vote to expand production, but not in this pristine, protected ecosystem at this time. Its yield will not solve our problems, but its cost may be more than we can afford.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I recently visited the Arctic Wildlife Refuge. It is an area that I have not visited before in previous trips to Alaska and I wanted to see this controversial area for myself. I spent a several days hiking, camping, exploring the wilderness, flying over some of the vast stretches, talking to Alaskans and spending time in the Prudhoe Bay area with representatives of the petroleum industry.

I saw caribou in vast numbers and witnessed the fragility of the tundra with small willows that are 20 and 30 years old that are only inches high. I thought a lot about what would happen if there were problems with drilling in this area. I came away with a profound sense that the American public is right. The Arctic Wildlife Refuge is absolutely the last place we should be exploring for oil, not the first.

A rational national energy policy must place conservation and efficiency at the forefront. Merely ending the fuel efficiency loophole for SUV and light trucks will save more oil that the Arctic Refuge will produce.

With only 2 to 3 percent of the world's reserves—and an energy habit that accounts for 25 percent of the world's consumption—the United States simply cannot produce enough energy to meet its demand.

We would do better to use the 10 years it would take to get the oil from the coastal plain to improve the energy efficiency of our transportation system, homes and factories, and develop a significant, meaningful, long-term national energy policy.

The Arctic refuge should be left alone.

Mr. Chairman, as Yogi Berra once said, "It's deja vu all over again."

Once before, this House held an important debate on whether to open up a portion of Alaska to oil and gas exploration. The arguments were about the same as what we've been hearing today. Supporters said it was critical for our national energy security. Opponents said it couldn't be done safely.

The vote was close, but Congress authorized drilling in Prudhoe Bay. Imagine how much more dependent the United States would have been on oil from Saddam Hussein and the Ayatollah if that courageous and far-sighted decision had not been made.

Now, it's our time.

I've been to Alaska, and I have seen how oil and gas exploration can be done, while preserving the natural beauty of the State. I have personally seen the tract in ANWR that we are talking about. It is an area with important new reserves where drilling was contemplated long ago. I left convinced that exploration and the environment can comfortably coexist. I just wish that more people could see first-hand the area that we're talking about.

The higher energy prices we've experienced lately, really come down to the old law of supply and demand. Our economy has been growing, but we haven't been producing enough energy to keep up. Opening up a sliver of ANWR is a sensible way to increase our energy supplies, while at the same time making us less dependent on foreign oil.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Markey-Johnson amendment to prevent